



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,291	12/20/2006	Shigeaki Aoki	2006-0527A	4492
513 7590 02/23/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER LAZORCIC, JASON L				
ART UNIT 1791		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/23/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/576,291		AOKI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	JASON L. LAZORCIK		1791	

All Participants:

(1) JASON L. LAZORCIK.

(2) Michael R. Davis (Reg. no. 25,134).

Date of Interview: February 5, 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

ALL

Prior art documents discussed:

Takagi (US7,538,050), Aldrich et. al. "The Occurrence of He3 in Natural Sources of Helium", Physical Review, v.74,n.11,(1945),pp.1590-1594

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

//Jason L Lazorcik/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791

Status of Application: Aldrich et. al.

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Date: February 11, 2010

Applicant was advised that the Takagi document discloses a glass composition comprising a helium concentration in the range of Applicants most preferred, disclosed concentration and manufactured by bubbling helium gas through a glass melt. Applicant was further advised that although Takagi does not disclose the isotopic ratio of He3 to He4 in the glass contained helium concentration, Aldrich makes plain that helium derived from natural gas sources (e.g. the most typical industrial source for helium gas) has a He3/He4 ratio approximately an order of magnitude less than that of atmospheric gas. Applicant was finally advised that, in view of Aldrich, it would appear evident that processing a glass melt by bubbling with He gas would inherently give rise to a He3/He4 ratio lower than that displayed by atmospheric gas or alternately that such a condition would be reasonably derived by a skilled practitioner through course of performing the Takagi disclosed process with typical, industrial sources of He gas.

Applicant was advised that the prior art does not teach nor reasonably suggest employing a measured value of the He3/He4 ratio as a means to exercise control over the glass manufacturing process. The Examiner indicated that 1) canceling claims 1-8 and 2) incorporating the limitations of claim 11 into independent claim 9 and adding a limitation which states, "and setting or changing a production condition for the glass article on the basis of the measured volume ratio" would place the application in condition for allowance. That is, no reference viewed alone nor in combination reasonably teaches nor suggests a method for manufacturing a glass article as recited in claims 9 and 11 whereby the process conditions are controlled responsive to a measured value of the volume isotope ratio of He3/He4.

Applicant's representative indicated that a response from Applicant regarding the proposed amendments would not be possible within the timeframe required by the Office. Applicant was advised that an Office Action corresponding to the above discussed prior art would be issued and Applicant was invited to contact the undersigned Examiner upon receipt and consideration of the prior art rejection.